

Interview Summary

Application No.

09/337,667

Applicant(s)

SASAKI ET AL.

Examiner

David Yockey

Art Unit

2861

#10

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Susan Perng Pan (Applicants' Representative). (3) _____.

(2) David Yockey (Examiner). (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 30 April 2001.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description:

Claim(s) discussed: 1 and 12.

Identification of prior art discussed: Takanashi et al. (US 4,527,171) and Fujimura et al. (US 5,397,763).


Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview(if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.


DAVID F. YOCKEY
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Discussed the objection and rejection of claim 12; no agreement was reached in this regard. Discussed the new limitation added to claim 1 in the amendment filed 23 April 2001; the Examiner agreed that the amendment overcomes the rejection under 35 USC 102, but that further consideration and/or search would be required to determine patentability. Discussed the teachings of Fujimura et al. and the cushion layer, with particular attention to column 2, lines 1-5 of Fujimura et al..